

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

DENNIS D. LINEHAN,

Case No. 18-CV-3483-WMW-KMM

Plaintiff,

v.

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**

NANCY JOHNSTON,
EMILY JOHNSON PIPER,
JASON J. DEFIBAUGH,
BRIAN S. NINNEMAN,
ANDREA L. RIMODE,
CORINNE HOADLEY,
TERRY KNEISEL,
DARLENE L. HARRIS,
JUSTIN L. JOSLIN,
RANDY GORDON,

Defendants.

In an order dated January 24, 2019, this Court directed Plaintiff Dennis Linehan to supplement the information provided in his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. See [ECF No. 6]. Mr. Linehan was given until February 13, 2019, to submit additional financial information, failing which it would be recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

That deadline has now passed, and Mr. Linehan has not supplemented his application with additional financial information. In fact, Mr. Linehan has not

communicated with the Court about this case at all since commencing this action. Accordingly, this Court now recommends, in accordance with its prior order, that this action be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute. *See Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel*, 267 Fed. App'x 496, 497 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (“A district court has discretion to dismiss an action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order.”).

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

Date: February 20, 2019

s/ Katherine Menendez
Katherine Menendez
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE

Filing Objections: This Report and Recommendation is not an order or judgment of the District Court and is therefore not appealable directly to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under Local Rule 72.2(b)(1), “a party may file and serve specific written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed finding and recommendations within 14 days after being served a copy” of the Report and Recommendation. A party may respond to those objections within 14 days after being served a copy of the objections. *See* Local Rule 72.2(b)(2). All objections and responses must comply with the word or line limits set forth in Local Rule 72.2(c).